



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

And yet we do not receive that faith on the authority of any number of men. We receive it because we know alike from creeds and Scripture that it is the faith which Christ and his Apostles taught, and that it has come down to our times from them.

As for the argument of mere numbers, we again say, we distrust it, because we know it cannot stand at the judgment of Christ hereafter; and no argument can be worth anything now which cannot prevail in the judgment then. Suppose any poor mortal should then presume to say to the Great Judge, "I always tried to be of the religion of the majority," will not Christ say to him, with truth, "I gave you this warning from the beginning, and if you had searched the Scripture you would have found it—*Enter ye in at the narrow gate; for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there are who go in thereat. How narrow is the gate and straight is the way that leadeth to life; and few there are that find it.*"*

WHAT TRADITION TELLS US OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY—No. III.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA—TERTULLIAN.

In our last volume we inserted an article, headed, "What Scripture tells us of the Blessed Virgin," in which we printed all the passages of the New Testament in which we found any mention made of her. For the satisfaction of those who might be discontented with the meagreness of the Scripture accounts of her, we determined to publish, in a series of articles, all that we could learn on the same subject from tradition; and we have already given, in two articles, all that we could find concerning her in several Christian Fathers of the first and second centuries. To complete our account of the writers of the second century, it only remains for us to notice the two whose names we have placed at the head of this article—Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian.

We confess that in this examination we have some fear of being tedious. We have brought forward Father after Father only to say—"We can find nothing in this writer about the Blessed Virgin." It must be rather tiresome for a jury, when a counsel puts witness after witness on the table, each of whom has nothing to say but—"I know nothing of the matter you have summoned me here to give evidence about." Our readers may ask—"Why do you not skip over all the Fathers who say nothing about the Virgin Mary, and come at once to those who have something to tell concerning her?" This is the plan adopted by Roman Catholic collectors of quotations from the Fathers. They know very well that, with the generality of people, one Father is just as good as another, and that, if they can produce a strong passage from any one in their favour, few will inquire in what century the writer lived, or whether he invented the doctrine himself or found it in the writings of his predecessors. Accordingly they are quite satisfied if they can produce a sufficient number of Greek or Latin authors in their favour, although, perhaps, they have not brought forward anything to their purpose from any writer who lived within four hundred years after our Saviour's birth.

We, however, think it very little use to inquire what was said on this, or on any other religious subject, in the sixth century, until we have first examined what was said on it in the first and second; for we are not bound to believe every doctrine that any pious person thinks proper to hold, but only such doctrines as he can show to have been handed down to him from our Saviour. We think it will appear, from the present series of articles, that there is still extant enough of works written in the first three centuries to enable us to judge of the views held in their days with regard to the Blessed Virgin. The writers of the works referred to were so eminent that they could not have been ignorant of the doctrines then held by the Church; and the subject is so important that they would not be likely to pass it over in silence, had their views been the same as those now entertained in the Church of Rome. We have more than once remarked before, that we have had many proofs lately, that bishops who believe the Virgin to be the Queen of Heaven—the paramount intercessor with her Son—the most effectual help in all emergencies—do not think it right to abstain from frequently impressing on their people the duty of constantly having recourse to this means of obtaining assistance.

But CLEMENT of ALEXANDRIA certainly did not think it any part of his duty to give instruction to those whom he taught on the duty of seeking the intercession of the Virgin. This eminent Christian philosopher flourished at the close of the second century, at the head of the great Alexandrian catechetical school, which attained so much celebrity, under the direction successively of Pantænus, Clement, and Origen. The writings of Clement which remain are sufficiently voluminous, and contain much valuable information as to the doctrine of the Church in his time. He speaks in them of our Lord's being born of a virgin, but he does not mention his mother with peculiar titles of honour, nor does he once hint at the addressing of prayers to her. And the following is one of several passages from which

we conclude that in his time the Church offered no prayers to any but the Supreme God:—

"It is the extreme of ignorance to ask from those who are not gods as though they were gods. . . . Whence, since there is one only good God, both we ourselves and the angels supplicate from him alone, that some good things might be given to us, and others might remain with us."—*Stromata*, Book vii., p. 853, (Oxford, 1715). You are not to suppose that the heathen with whom Clement had to argue were so unenlightened as to worship other deities as equal to the Supreme God. They did, indeed, offer prayers to the spirits of deceased virtuous men, or to demons, as they called them. We quote Clement's account of the defence which the heathen made for this practice, and we invite our readers to compare it with what is now said by Roman Catholic divines in defence of the worship of the saints.—

"But they think that it matters nothing whether we speak of these as gods, or as angels, giving to the spirits of such the names of demons, and teaching that they should be worshipped by men as having, by Divine Providence, on account of the purity of their lives, received authority to be conversant about earthly places, in order that they may minister to mortals."—*Stromata*, Book vi., p. 753.

Having failed to extract anything from Clement more to our purpose than the passages cited, we proceed next to TERTULLIAN, the celebrated Presbyter of Carthage. Of the general estimation in which this light of the African Church was held, we can give no better testimony than the anecdote which St. Jerome records of St. Cyprian.

"I saw one Paulus, who had seen Cyprian's secretary at Rome, who used to tell him that Cyprian never passed a single day without reading Tertullian, and that he often said to him, 'Give me my master,' meaning Tertullian."—*Jerome*, vol. iv., part ii., p. 115. Tertullian in his later years became a believer in the pretensions to inspiration of a fanatic, named Montanus. His later works must, therefore, be cited with caution. This circumstance, however, does not affect the value of his evidence on the subject we are discussing, since there is no difference in this point between Tertullian's earlier works and his later, and it does not appear that the Montanists had any disagreement with the orthodox relative to the Blessed Virgin.

Well, then, in all Tertullian we do not find a single allusion to the offering of prayers to the Virgin by any sect of Christians in his time; and, on the contrary, we find that he, as well as Clement, was possessed with the prejudice that prayers should be offered to God only. He says—

"These things I cannot ask in prayer from any other except him from whom I know that I shall obtain; because he is the one who alone grants, and I am one whom it behoveth to obtain by prayer."—*Apology*, p. 27, Paris, 1675.

And, again, he makes the following remarks on our Lord's command to pray *in secret*:—"By this precept he required in a man's faith to believe that both the sight and the hearing of the omnipotent God are present under our roofs and in our secret places; and he desired the lowliness of faith, that man should offer his worship to him alone who hears and sees everywhere."—*On Lord's Prayer*, p. 129.

Our business, however, being more particularly with what this Father thought of the Virgin Mary, we shall quote his commentary on one of the passages of the Scripture in which she is mentioned. Although we printed it already, in the first article of this series, yet, to make this Father's comment more intelligible, we print it here again:—

"While he yet talked to the people, behold his mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him; then one said unto him, Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee: but he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand to his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren. For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother."—*Matt. xii. 46-50.*

A Roman Catholic cannot deny that the first view of this passage presents him with difficulties. We find Jesus, who is commonly represented by them as ready to grant anything, no matter what, to the slightest wish of his mother, here refusing even to come out to speak to her; we find him, instead of pointing her out to his disciples as an object of their special veneration, and as holding a place in his dispensation which no other mortal was to attain unto, on the contrary, leading them to suppose that their place in his favour was determined, not by the closeness of their earthly relationship to him, but by their readiness to do his Father's will; and we find the Virgin Mary herself, instead of being among the most attentive hearers of his Son's discourses, "standing without," and summoning him away from his preaching. To those, therefore, whose principle it is to interpret Scripture according to the consent of the Fathers, we feel that we shall be doing a service if we lay before them what some of the most eminent of them have thought of the passage we have just referred to.

The following is Tertullian's comment on it (*De Carne Christi*, vii., p. 315):—

"But what reason is there for the answer which denied his mother and his brethren? The brothers of our Lord had not believed on him, as it is contained in the Gospel. His mother, in like manner, is not shown to have adhered to him; whereas other Marys and Marthas were often in his company. By this passage, finally, their unbelief is made evident. Whilst he was teaching the way of life, whilst he was engaged in curing sickness and evils, at a time when strangers were fixedly intent upon him, these persons, so nearly related to him, were absent. At last they come up, and stand outside the door, and do not enter—not thinking, forsooth, of what was going on there; nor do they wait; just as though they were bringing something more urgent than the business in which he was engaged—nay, moreover, they interrupt him, and endeavour to recall him from so great a work.

"Now I pray you, Apelles, and you, Marcion, if perchance, when you were playing at chess, or disputing about players or charioteers, you were called away by such a message, would you not have said, 'Who is my mother and who are my brethren?' And whilst Christ was preaching and setting forth God, fulfilling the law and the prophets, dispersing the darkness of so many eyes, did he undeservedly employ this saying, to strike at the unbelief of those who stood without, or to shake off the importunity of those who were calling him away from his work?"

The same writer says elsewhere on this passage—"Christ with reason felt indignant, that whilst strangers were bent intently on his discourse, persons so nearly related to him should stand without, seeking, moreover, to call him away from his solemn work."—*Adv. Marcionem* iv. 19, p. 433.

Here, then, we have Tertullian putting on the anecdote recorded in the Gospels the construction the least respectful to the mother of our Lord. He represents her as, at the time, not being a believer in her Son; he speaks of her absence from his preaching as censurable, and her attempt to interrupt him as deservedly calling forth the rebuke which it met with. When we find an eminent writer of the second century adopting views so unlike those now entertained in the Church of Rome, it is proper to ask—Does he fairly represent the sentiments of the Church in his day? Now, as we have pointed out the fact, that Tertullian became a schismatic in his later years, we think it necessary to show that his interpretation of this passage was that adopted by distinguished writers for very many years after; and though it somewhat interrupts our following the chronological order, we shall give the comment of St. Ambrose and St. Chrysostom on the same passage.

St. Ambrose says (vol. i., p. 1392)—"Whereas our Lord was about to instruct others, that one who would not leave his father and mother is not worthy of the Son of God, he first subjects himself to this same rule; not that he might disclaim the kindnesses of maternal piety (for his own rule is, He who honoureth not his father or mother, let him die the death), but because he acknowledges that he owes more to the mysteries of his Father than to the affections of his mother. Nor are parents unjustly discarded here; but the ties of the mind are represented as more obligatory than the ties of the body. They ought not to stand without who seek to see Christ; for if parents themselves, when they stand without, are not acknowledged (and, perhaps, they are not acknowledged, for an example to us), how shall we be acknowledged if we stand without?"

But Chrysostom's comment on the same passage uses far stronger language (vol. vii., p. 407, Benedictine edition, 1718):—

"What I lately said, that if virtue be absent all besides is superfluous, this is now proved abundantly. I was saying that age, and nature, and the living in a wilderness, and all such things, were unprofitable unless our principle and our purpose were good; but today we learn something more, that not even the conceiving of Christ in the womb, and bringing forth that wonderful birth, hath any advantage if there be not virtue; and this is specially manifested from this circumstance—'Whilst he was yet speaking,' says the Evangelist, 'some one says to him—Thy mother and thy brethren seek thee; and he said, who is my mother and my brethren?' Now, this he said, not because he felt ashamed of his mother, nor with the intention of denying her who brought him forth—for had he been ashamed he would not have passed through her womb—but it was to show that she would derive no advantage from this unless she did her duty in everything. Now, what she was then undertaking was the effect of *excessive ambition*; for she wished to show to the people that she commanded and controlled her son, she having as yet formed no high opinion of him; consequently, she comes to him unseasonably. Now, see the foolish arrogance both of herself and of them!" Whereas they ought

* Lest our readers should entertain any doubt as to the accuracy of our translation, we give the original text of this sentence, with a Latin version—

Kai γὰρ ὅπερ ἐπεχείρησε, φιλοτιμίας ην περιττης·

to have entered, and heard him with the multitude; or, had they been unwilling to do this, to have waited till he had finished his discourse, and then to have approached him, they call for him out; and this they do before all, exhibiting their excessive ambition, and wishing to show that they commanded him with great authority—a point which the Evangelist marks with disapprobation; for it was to intimate this that he said, ‘Whilst he was yet speaking to the multitude;’ as much as if he had said—What! was there no other opportunity? What! could they not have conversed with him in private? And what after all did they want to say? If it was on the doctrines of the truth, then it was right he should propound to all in common, and to speak before all, that others also might be benefitted. But if it was on other subjects of interest to themselves, they ought not to have been thus urgent. For if he would not suffer a man to bury his father, that his following of him might not be broken off, much more ought his address not to have been interrupted for things which were not of interest to him. Hence it is evident that they did this solely out of vain glory. And John shows this when he says—‘Neither did his brethren believe on him.’ And he records some words of theirs full of great folly, when he tells us that they took him to Jerusalem, not for any other purpose but that they might themselves derive glory from his miracles. If thou do these things, said they, show thyself to the world; for no one doeth anything in secret and seeketh himself to be conspicuous. At which time he rebuked them for this, reproving their carnal mind. For when the Jews reproached him, saying—‘Is not this the carpenter’s son, whose father and mother we know? and his brethren, are they not among us?’ they, wishing to get rid of the charge, from the meanness of his origin, excited him to a display of miracles. He, therefore, gives them a repulse, wishing to heal their malady; since had he desired to deny his mother, he would surely then have denied her when they cast the reproach. On the contrary, he shows himself to have entertained so great care for her, that on the very cross he intrusts her to the disciple, who was his best beloved of all, and leaves many kind injunctions concerning her. But he does not so now, and that because of his care for her and his brethren; for since they approached him as a mere man, and were puffed up with vain glory, he expels that disease, not by insulting them, but by correcting them. . . . And why did he chide her? He did not wish to excite doubt in her mind, but to remove the most tyrannical of passions, and, by little and little, to lead to a correct estimate of himself, and to persuade her that he was not only her son, but her sovereign Lord.* You will thus see that the rebuke was eminently becoming in him, and profitable to her, and withal contains much of mildness. So likewise when the woman cried out—‘Blessed is the womb that bore thee,’ he says not—‘She is not my mother;’ but, ‘if she wishes to be blessed, let her do the will of my Father: for such a one is my brother, and sister, and mother! Oh, how great an honour! How great a virtue! To what an exalted eminence does it carry one who embraces it! How many women have called that Holy Virgin and her womb blessed, and have longed to be such mothers, and to give up everything besides! What is there to hinder them? For behold he has cut out for us a broad way, and it is in the power not of woman only, but of man also to be placed in such a rank as that—rather in a much higher one; for this far more constitutes one his mother than did these labour pangs. So that, if that is a cause for calling one blessed, much more is this, inasmuch as it is paramount. Do not, then, merely desire, but also, with much diligence, walk along the path which leads to the object of your desire.’

Here, then, we find St. Chrysostom imputing to the

ιβούλετο γάρ ένδειξασθαι τῷ δήμῳ, ὅτι κρατεῖ καὶ αὐθεντεῖ τὸν παιδός, οὐδὲν ὄντεπω περὶ αὐτὸν μέγα φαγαράζομέν· ἐνὶ καὶ ἀκαίρως προσῆλθεν. ‘Ορα γοῦν καὶ αὐτῆς καὶ ἱκείνων τὴν ἀπόνοιαν.

Nam quod illa fecit, ex nimia ambitione proficiscebatur; volebat enim populo sese ostentare ac si imperaret filio, de quo nihil adhuc magnum imaginabatur, ideoque importune accessit. Vide ergo et ejus (matris sc.) et fratribus arrogantiam.

* We also give the original text of this passage.

Ἄλλ’ οὐχὶ νῦν τοῦτο ποιεῖ κηδομένος αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν. Ἐπειδὴ γάρ ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ προστίχον φιλῶ, καὶ ἱεροδόξουν, τὸ νόσημα ἱεράλλει, οὐχὶ ἴβριζων ἀλλὰ διορθούμενος . . . καὶ τι βούλομενος ἐπετίμα; οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔξαπορησαί θέλων, ἀλλ’ ἀπαλλάξαι τὸν τυραννικάτου πάθον, καὶ κατὰ μικρὸν ἐναγάγειν εἰς τὴν προσήκουσαν περὶ αὐτὸν ἔννοιαν, καὶ πεῖσαι ὅτι οὐχὶ νὺν αὐτῆς μόνον ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Δεσπότης.

At nunc non similiter facit, ut illi (matris sc.) et fratribus suis recte consulere. Quis enim illum nudum hominem esse sentiat, atque inani gloria agebantur, morbum illum depellit, non ad contumeliam, sed ad emendationem.

Et quid volens irrepavit? Non enim ut illum (matrem, sc.) in dubium induceret, sed at a tyrannico morbo liberaret, ac paulatim induceret ad congruentem de se opinionem, suaderetque ipsi, se non modo filium ipsius esse, sed etiam Dominum.

Blessed Virgin “excessive ambition,” “vain glory,” disbelief in her son. It was no wonder that the Benedictine editors, though they do not ordinarily give marginal annotations, here cannot keep silence, but exclaim “Fair words, Chrysostom,” when even Calvin puts a construction on the passage far more honourable to the character of our Lord’s mother. But, however we interpret this passage, we have said enough to show that Tertullian’s interpretation was not heretical, but was followed by the most eminent doctors of the Church. And we have said enough to show that the views held in that age, with regard to the Virgin’s character, were very different from those entertained in the Church of Rome. Now-a-days, men would fain represent her as free from *original sin*. In the fifth century, and, those preceding, the saints of the Church were so far from having any tradition to this effect, that they imputed *actual sin* to her without scruple. It seems needless to ask whether any of them addressed prayer to her. However, we hope in a future article to continue this investigation, in the case of the Fathers of the third century.*

THE MORTMAIN COMMITTEE.

In our February number we noticed the well-known case of *Metairie v. Wiseman*, as illustrating the extent to which clerical influence is exercised by Roman Catholic priests in extorting dispositions of property in their favour from persons weakened by disease and old age. And we added the observation, that as the property so obtained was retained by those who, by their position, possessed undoubted control over the agents employed in the transaction itself, we have a right to assume that these means of procuring property are sanctioned by the doctrines and rules of that Church over which they preside. The next case pointing to the same conclusion, is that of Mr. Taylor, Weybridge. That gentleman, who had a family of two sons and three daughters, when in the 77th or 78th year, and in the full possession of health and vigour of mind, made his will, by which he gave the whole of his estate amongst his children, absolutely. About four years afterwards, when in his 81st year, and after a protracted illness of twelve months, and within three months before his death, in 1846, he made a new will, by which, after leaving all his property to his children successively, for their lives merely, the ultimate reversion in all was given to Dr. Griffiths, the Vicar Apostolic of the London district, and to his successors for the time being. And at the time of the discussion of this case before the Mortmain Committee, this ultimate reversion was vested in Dr. Wiseman.

The son of Mr. Taylor, from whose examination the foregoing facts are stated, and who is himself, of course, a Roman Catholic, states that, previous to the making of that last will, his father had stated to himself as well as to many others, that he would not think of leaving anything to the Church—that it was the most foolish thing in the world. He further stated, that at the time when his father first communicated to him his intention of making the will in favour of the Church, he could not think of reasoning with him on the subject, because he found him in that state that he was incapable of holding anything like an argument upon it; and that although naturally a very strong-minded man, from his long illness he had become exceedingly changed. As evidence of the extent to which that change had gone, he says that his father, at the same time that he declared the disposition he proposed to make, was for the benefit of his soul, and for the benefit of all their souls, assured him that he had left to his son personally £100,000, though his whole estate would not, if sold, realize anything like that sum, even including the devise to the Vicar Apostolic, and was, therefore, a mere delusion on the part of the testator.

Such was the evidence as to the circumstances under which this will was made. It did not appear by whom the will was suggested, nor whether there was any direct interference on the part of any spiritual adviser. It appears, also, that the other members of Mr. Taylor’s family were so much under the clerical influence, and in so precarious a state of health, that Mr. Taylor, the gentleman examined, had determined to abstain from appealing to the law against the disposition made by his father.

In consequence of this indisposition on the part of the person most deeply interested in disputing the will, this case, at the time it occurred, did not come before the public. And the manner in which ultimately it was brought forward certainly reflects no little discredit on Cardinal Wiseman, and is, in our judgment, as remarkable an instance of equivocation as ever came before our notice.

It appears that in 1850, during the excitement consequent on what is called by Protestants the Papal aggression, the circumstances of the above case began to be whispered abroad. It was said that four children of

an aged father had been disinherited, and that the Cardinal and his Church were to reap the benefit. Upon this an English Dissenter, a Mr. John Dean, who had heard the rumour, took the straightforward course of writing to the Cardinal, mentioning the report, and saying that he would be glad to be put in a position to contradict it. To this application the Cardinal did reply in a letter from which the following are extracts:—

“DEAR SIR—I am much obliged for your manly and straightforward application to me. I never in my life saw nor spoke to nor corresponded with the late Mr. Taylor. I am not named in his will. Since coming to London I have had the pleasure of making the acquaintance of Mr. Taylor’s excellent family. I have visited them at Weybridge. I am on terms of perfect good understanding with Mr. James Taylor, the supposed disinherited son, who, with his sisters, enjoys every thing of his father’s property.”

Now, could any one, after reading that letter, have for one moment supposed that Mr. Taylor had in truth made a will disposing of his property substantially in favour of the Church, and that that substantial gift was, at the very time of writing the letter, vested in the Cardinal? and yet the letter is so worded that it is verbally true. The gift was not by name to Cardinal Wiseman, but by description it then belonged to him. The son and his sisters did then enjoy every farthing of the present income of their father’s property; but yet, if that property had then been sold and distributed between the tenants for life, and those entitled in remainder, two-thirds of the proceeds would have gone into the pocket of the Cardinal. Now, what meaning did Cardinal Wiseman intend to convey to his correspondent? Mr. Dean, unaccustomed to the casuistical refinements which draw a distinction between a denial “simpliciter” and a denial “secundum quid” forthwith sent the Cardinal’s letter to a dissenting journal, “The British Banner,” who at once published it, with observations denouncing the report in question, as a malignant lie. And we believe every honest-minded individual would have drawn a similar conclusion, and, trusting to the written statement of Cardinal Wiseman, have discredited the whole report.

Unfortunately for the Cardinal he trusted too much to the unwillingness of Mr. Taylor’s son to bring before the public the wrongs that he had received; for, trusting to that gentleman’s submission to his spiritual rulers, he inadvertently ventured, in his letter to Mr. Dean, to refer to Mr. James Taylor, the son, as offering to give any contradiction he (Cardinal Wiseman) pleased to the calumny. This was going rather too far, and Mr. Taylor, although unwilling to involve himself and his family in litigation, still could not suppress altogether the feelings of disappointment and annoyance which his father’s will had necessarily produced. He, therefore, published a letter, very different indeed in its tenor, from that which the Cardinal calculated on eliciting. He says:—“The bulk of my father’s property is left to his children for their lives only; and upon their decease is given to the use of the late Dr. Griffith’s, if living, and if not to the then Vicar Apostolic, for the London district, (then Dr. Wiseman) for the time being. The will contains no power enabling me to make any provision whatever in favour of a wife or children; but, on the contrary, my life estate is coupled with very stringent provisions against any attempt at incumbrance or alienation. Such a will appeared to me to create not a *supposed*, but a real and effectual disinheritance; and such I have always felt it to be. I should add, that the will was executed by a most kind and affectionate parent, after he had attained the age of 80 years and upwards, and when his mind was affected by severe illness, and in immediate contemplation of that great change, the approach of which renders the strongest and best prepared *wholly unable to resist any influences which may be brought to assume the sanction of religion.*” Such is the mild unexaggerated statement of a son, who, when asked if there had ever been any interruption of filial confidence between him and his deceased parent, was able to answer—“I never to my knowledge had a word with him in the course of a long life.”

And with such facts before us, may we not well urge our Roman Catholic brethren to examine diligently and earnestly the truth of those doctrines of their Church which place in the hands of the priesthood such powerful means of augmenting the wealth of the Church, at the expense and to the injury of those entitled by every tie of affection to the remembrance and consideration of their dying relatives? And ought they not vehemently to suspect the motives of those who, in maintaining these doctrines, thereby retain the power and ability of converting the fears and the weaknesses of their dying penitents into an unfailing fountain of wealth and influence for that great clerical corporation of which they form a part?

THE WORD “SACRAMENT.”

THE WORD “SACRAMENT” only occurs once in THE DOUAY BIBLE—viz., Epistle to the Ephesians, v. 32.

St. Paul wrote this epistle in the Greek language, and the word he wrote was *μυστηριον*; written in English letters this word would be “mysterion.”

* The reader desirous of further information will find it in Mr. Tyler’s work on the worship of the Virgin, in which he has collected with great industry the testimony of the Fathers on this subject. We have been much indebted to his work in these articles; and as far as we have followed his steps, we have not been able to find that he has omitted any important passage in which the Blessed Virgin is spoken of.